

Handwritten mark



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/808,263	03/14/2001	Peter H. Golde	777.414US1	3366

7590 06/15/2004

STEVEN J. ROCCI
WOODCOCK WASHBURN KURTZ
MACKIEWICZ & NORRIS LLP
ONE LIBERTY PLACE -46TH FLOOR
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103

EXAMINER

HOANG, PHUONG N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2126

DATE MAILED: 06/15/2004

Handwritten number 7

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Handwritten signature

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/808,263

Applicant(s)

GOLDE ET AL.

Examiner

Phuong N. Hoang

Art Unit

2126

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 March 2004.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 - 87 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 - 87 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1 – 87 are pending for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. **Claims 1 – 7, 12 - 14, 16 – 30, 35 – 37, 39 – 46, 51 – 53, 55 – 62, 67 – 69, 71 – 78, 83 – 85, 87 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brumme, US patent no. 6,134,559 in view of Hejlsberg, US patent no. 6,185,728.**

4. **As to claim 1**, Brumme teaches a method for operating a computer using object-based computer code, the method comprising the steps of:

invoking an event handler (event handler, col. 14 lines 48 – 57) method by calling another method of an instance of a class (objects respond to event by calling related methods, col. 15 lines 28 – 30 and col. 14 lines 48 – 57) calling related method for which parameters (event is passed via parameters, col. 15 lines 1 – 5) passed to the

other method are also passed to the event handler method, a parameter list (signature include a parameter list, col. 14 lines 66 – col. 15 lines 10) of the other method having a same signature as a parameter list of the event handler method (inherits when the object is derived, col. 7 lines 25 – 45, and col. 12 lines 55 - 60), wherein the other method references the event handler method;

creating an invocation list associated with the other method, the invocation list specifying one or more event handler methods to be invoked (source objects package information into a package that represents information common to all events, col. 15 lines 1 – 15); and

dynamically altering contents of the invocation list (event signatures may be dynamically added at run time, col. 15 lines 35 – 40);

Brumme does not explicitly teach a delegate.

Hejlsberg teaches the step of delegation of an event handler (abstract, col. 3 lines 65 – col. 4 lines 10 and col. 13 lines 50 – 55); and the delegate contains a reference to the other method (all references is copied through delegation).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Brumme and Hejlsberg's system because Hejlsberg's delegation would provide an assignment to invoke a method and easy for the user to control the object behavior.

5. **As to claims 2 - 4**, Brumme teaches the step of adding an event handler method to the invocation list during execution of the object-based computer code (event signatures may be dynamically added at run time, col. 15 lines 35 – 40).

6. **As to claims 5 - 7**, Brumme teaches the step of comprising removing an event handler from the invocation list during execution of the object-based computer code (removing elements of that collection, col. 13 lines 40 – 62).

7. **As to claim 12**, Brumme teaches the step of wherein the event handler method is configured to handle an override event having a signature (passing methods from a parent or base type to one or more child or derived types signatures, col. 1 lines 45 – 60).

8. **As to claim 13**, Brumme teaches the step of identifying an accessible event having a same signature as the override event (inherits when the object is derived, col. 7 lines 25 – 45, and col. 12 lines 55 - 60).

9. **As to claim 14**, Brumme teaches the step of wherein the event handler method is configured to handle an abstract event (object systems may include abstract classes, col. 7 lines 40 – 45).

10. **As to claim 16**, Brumme teaches the steps of wherein the parameters passed to the other method to the event handler method comprise:

a sender parameter identifying an event source (source object, col. 14 lines 66 - col. 15 lines 15);

an event arguments parameter identifying one or more event arguments (arguments may be passed as extra parameters, col. 15 lines 1 – 10).

11. **As to claim 17**, see rejection for claims 1 and 16 above.

12. **As to claims 18 – 23**, see rejection for claims 2 – 7 above.

13. **As to claim 24**, this is the software claim of claim 1. See rejection for claim 1 above. Further, Brumme teaches the step of event source module configured to issue an event (an object that raises an event is called source object, col. 14 lines 66 -col. 15 lines 15).

14. **As to claims 25 – 30**, see rejection for claims 2 – 7 above.

15. **As to claims 35 – 37**, see rejection for claims 12 – 14 above.

16. **As to claim 39**, see rejection for claim 16 above.

17. **As to claims 40 and 56**, see rejection for claim 24 above.
18. **As to claims 41 – 46, and 57 - 62**, see rejection for claims 25 – 30 above.
19. **As to claims 51 – 53, and 67 - 69**, see rejection for claims 35 – 37 above.
20. **As to claims 55 and 71**, see rejection for claim 39 above.
21. **As to claim 72**, this is the system claim of claim 1. See rejection for claim 1 above.
22. **As to claims 73 – 78**, see rejection for claims 2 – 7 above.
23. **As to claims 83 – 85**, see rejection for claims 12 – 14 above.
24. **As to claim 87**, see rejection for claim 16 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

25. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2126

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

26. Claims 8 – 11, 31 – 34, 47 - 49, 50, 63 – 66, 79 - 82 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brumme, US patent no. 6,134,559 in

view of Hejlsberg, US patent no. 6,185,728, and further in view of Wold, US patent no. 5,724,589.

27. As to claims 8, 9, 31, 32, 47, 48, 63, 64, and 79 - 80, Brumme and Hejlsberg do not teach the step of wherein the event handler method is configured to handle a static event.

Wold teaches the step of wherein the event handler method is configured to handle a static event (static member function, fig. 5, col. 8 lines 35 – 67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Brumme, Hejlsberg, and Wold's system because Wold's static event would provide a design choice for defining event members.

28. As to claims 10, 33, 49, 65, and 81, Brumme and Hejlsberg do not teach the step of wherein the event handler method is configured to handle a virtual event.

Wold teaches the step of, wherein the event handler method is configured to handle a virtual event (virtual member function, fig. 5, col. 8 lines 35 – 67).

29. **As to claims 11, 34, 50, 66, and 82**, Brumme and Hejlsberg do not teach the step of further comprising overriding the virtual event.

Wold teaches the method of claim 10, comprising overriding (derived, col. 3 lines 12 – 15 and col. 8 lines 35 – 67) the virtual event.

30. **Claims 15, 38, 54, 70, 86 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brumme, US patent no. 6,134,559 in view of Hejlsberg, US patent no. 6,185,728, and further in view of Kimura, US patent no. 6,292,849.**

31. **As to claims 15, 38, 54, 70, and 86**, Brumme and Hejlsberg do not teach the step of wherein the event handler is configured to handle an interface event.

Kimura teaches interface event (event interface, col. 14 lines 32 – 35).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Brumme, Hejlsberg, and Kimura's system because the events also execute to control the interface.

Response to Arguments

32. Applicant's arguments filed on 3/24/04 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

33. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phuong N. Hoang whose telephone number is (703) 605-4239. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9:00 am to 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (703)305-9678. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ph
June 4, 2004



MENG-AL T. AN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100